



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/045,186	10/18/2001	Warren Thomas Johnson	USFMC.R.003C.1	4840

20995 7590 05/21/2003

KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP
2040 MAIN STREET
FOURTEENTH FLOOR
IRVINE, CA 92614

EXAMINER

MENON, KRISHNAN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/045,186

Applicant(s)

JOHNSON ET AL.

Examiner

Krishnan S Menon

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 are pending

Priority

Applicant's claim of priority (CON under 35 USC §120) based on the PCT application PCT/AU00/00352 is acknowledged.

Drawings

The corrected or substitute drawings were received on 3/10/03. These drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Okano et al (US 4,547,289).

Okano teaches a membrane manifold comprising a housing (2), a submodule connecting collar (see figures) adapted to receive the submodule, submodule sleeve with locking formation (see at 17) so that the submodule can be secured to the collar by a clip (17) adapted to engage both collar and locking formation by surrounding them to prevent axial withdrawal of the submodule as in claim 1 (see figures 1-17). Housing is in fluid communication with the collar as in claim 2 (see fig). Collar has an internal stepped seat for engaging the submodule (at 9) as in claim 3. locking formation has radially outwardly directed circumferential flange (see fig) as in claim 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
1. Claims 5-10, and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano (289) in view of Jenkins (US 6,048,454).

Okano teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Instant Claims add further limitations not taught by Okano, as follows: The clip is cylindrical with split sidewall which has a top and bottom in claim 5. The clip comprises radially inwardly directed circumferential flanges on top and bottom to engage with the sleeve and the collar in claims 6 and 7. Clip has projections on the sidewall adjacent the edges in claim 8, which extend longitudinally in claim 9. The top flange is partially circumferential in claim 10. Clip is mutually interengageable in claim 12, and adapted for over-centered circumferential locking in claim 13. Jenkins (454) teaches a clip in a filter apparatus which is cylindrical having split sidewalls and circumferential and inwardly directing flanges and means for circumferential locking (see fig 9). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of invention to use the teaching of Jenkins in the teaching of Okano because the details of the clip in Okano (part 17) are not clear, and the Jenkins clip is easy to operate (see Jenkins col 4 lines 16-20).

2. Claims 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano (289).

Okano teaches all the3 limitations of claim 11, as in claim 1 above, except for the clip being hingedly connected. However, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to hingedly connect the clip to the collar, like pegging which is commonly practiced with keys and tools to an apparatus, so that they are not lost.

3. Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okano (289) in view of WO91/16124.

Okano teaches all the limitations of claim 1. Claims 14-16 add further limitations not taught by Okano, but taught by WO: Four submodules in the manifold in claim 14 (WO teaches multiple submodules – see figures). Collars are disposed in a common plane in claim 15 (see WO figures). One end of housing is adjacent each collar and axis of housing parallel with axis of collar (WO-figures). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of WO in the teaching of Okano to provide multiple modules for larger volume processing with easily replaceable filter cartridges (WO abstract).

4. Claims 17-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 91/16124 in view of Okano (289) and Jenkins (454).

WO (124) discloses a filter manifold with hollow fiber bundle filter cartridges (fig 1, 6), the apparatus has manifolds as head and base pieces (fig 1), a collar (56-fig 1) adapted to receive the

Art Unit: 1723

housing (11-fig 1), connecting sleeve with locking formation (20, 31-fig 1), clip adapted to engage the collar and lock formation (68-fig 2 and 20) that prevents axial withdrawal of the module as in claim 17.

WO does not teach a clip that surrounds the collar and the sleeve ends as in claim 17. Okano in view of Jenkins teaches such a clip in a submodule and manifold arrangement as in claim 1 above. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the teaching of Okano in view of Jenkins in the teaching of WO to have good mechanical seal for manufacture of water free of bacteria, etc (Okano – abstract) and have very quick release of the clip (Jenkins col 4 lines 16-20).

Claims 18-21 and 30 add further limitations, which are taught by WO, as follows: Manifolds in head and base pieces as in claims 18 and 30 (see fig 1 and 5). Base piece can have a cleaning fluid conduit as in claim 19 and collars are adapted for placement of cleaning fluid conduit as in claim 20 (p-32 para-3; fig 1), there is a removable cap at the end of the housing as in claim 21 (31, fig 2).

Independent claim 22-29 add the further limitations to claim 17 above, which are taught by WO, of a bank of filtration apparatus (see fig 5 and 6) and filtrate and cleaning fluid conduits as in claim 22 (43-fig 2; p-32 Para 3 – back wash), filtrate and cleaning fluid conduits are above head and base piece (fig 2) (claim 23); cleaning fluid conduit between two pairs of submodule collars (claim 24) (see 43-fig 2), aperture in cleaning fluid conduit (72, fig 2), housing is in communication with the filtrate conduit (49-fig 2), the array is adapted to be inserted in an open bank, and there is an array train (instant claim 25-30) (fig 1, 6).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krishnan S Menon whose telephone number is 703-305-5999. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

Application/Control Number: 10/045,186
Art Unit: 1723

Page 7

Krishnan Menon
Patent Examiner
May 15, 2003


W. L. WALKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700